



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/005,508	12/04/2001	Michael Kendrick Reiter	CHOCKLER 1-1-7	9654
47394	7590 11/17/2005		EXAM	INER
HITT GAINES, PC			DONAGHUE, LARRY D	
LUCENT TEC	CHNOLOGIES INC.			
PO BOX 8325	70		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
RICHARDSO:	N, TX 75083		2154	

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/005,508	REITER ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Larry D. Donaghue	2154				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app		orrespondence address				
Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period version for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	L. lely filed the mailing date of this communication.				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08/25	5/2005.					
<u> </u>	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar		secution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	·_ ···					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents		an No				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	• •					
application from the International Bureau	•					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	' ''	d.				
•	·					
Attachment(s)						
1) 🗵 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) 🗌 Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	te atent Application (PTO-152)				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	man rippiroduori (i 10-102)				

Application/Control Number: 10/005,508

Art Unit: 2154

Application/Control Number: 101005,508 Page 3

Art Unit: 2142

1. Claims 1-20 are presented for examination.

2. Applicant's arguments, filed 08/25/2005 with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) and the amendment made, have been fully considered and are persuasive in view of the amendment. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection was made (sse below).

3.

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 1-6, 8-12, 14-18 and 20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacLellan et al 6,177,861 in view of Bennett (5,734,909).

Regarding to claimed invention of claims 1,8 and 14, MacLellan et al teaches protocols that uses backoff/retry algorithm to randomly retransmit any non-acknowledged messages, see abstract, comprising, a client subsystem that generates a request for access to a shared resources such an application processor 101 communicates over a WAN to one or more Interrogators 103 and further communicates with one or more endpoints called Tag 105, see col. 2, lines 54-60, a server subsystem that receives said request, and returns a LOCKED indicator such as Interrogator 105 receives a data message 106 from processor 101, and in the Uplink Data Exchange Protocol, data is present in the Tag 105 which is required to be transmitted to Interrogator 103, and upon successful reception of this data, the acknowledgment message is received by Tag 105, see col. 4, lines 45-col. 5, lines 1-7. Furthermore MacLellan et al discloses that if Downlink acknowledgment signal is not successfully received, then Downlink Acknowledgment is delayed until time slot, see col. 5, lines 8-60. and in figure 6, Downlink data message is transmitted if Tag 105 does not successfully receives the Downlink data message, and waits for the next Downlink data transmission, see col. 7, lines 51-56. Regarding claims 2, 9, and 15 with broadest interpretation, MacLellan et al teaches length of time to required for Uplink data Exchange protocol 500 must be completed, see col. 5, lines 61-66.

MacLellan et al. did not expressly teach configuring the client to respond an amount of time after receiving the LOCKED indicator, this is taught by Bennett (col. 1, lines 47-50 and col. 2, lines 46-45), it would have been obvious to modify MacLellan et al. with the teaching of Bennett as it would provide for the orderly servicing of clients request.

Application/Control Number: 10/005,508

Art Unit: 2154

Regarding claims 3-6, 10-12, 16-18, and 20 claimed subject matter is inherently disclosed in the system of MacLellan since most often used protocols for a common bus network is referred to as carrier sense multiple-access/collision-detection, and implementation of this standard is called Ethernet which uses backoff/retry algorithm, and is used in shared network resources.

6. Claims 7,13 and 19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacLellan et al. and Bennett in view of Underwood (6,704,873).

Regarding to claimed invention MacLellan et al and Bennett did not disclose digitally signing client request. 6,704,873 teach global Internet working gateway architecture in an e-commerce environment including digital signature services. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention that any shared resources using Ethernet channel can make advantageous use of digital signature to gain secure access. The teaching of digital signature services of Underwood would provide secure transmission and acknowledgment of single packet of the combined teaching of MacLellan et al. and Bennett.

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Preslan et al.	Device Locks: Mutual Exclusion for Storage Area Network	
Mizuno et al.	Lock-Based Self-Stabliizing Distributed Mutual Exclusion Algorithms	
Cypher	The Communication Requirements of Mutual Exclusion	
Hsieh et al.	Decentralized Mutual Exclusion in The Presence of Link Failures	
Marshall et al.	6,662,252	
McLaughlin et al.	6,959,337	
Reuter et al.	6,463,532	
Higuchi et al.	6,502,136	
Brealey et al.	6,026,401	
Shimbo et al.	5,835,601	
White et al.	5,293,621	
Henson et al.	5,226,159	
Sakakura et al.	5,625,795	
Buch	5,669,002	

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Larry D. Donaghue whose telephone number is 571-272-3962. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-5:00.

Application/Control Number: 10/005,508

Art Unit: 2154

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 571-272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LARRY D. DONAGHUE PRIMARY EXAMINER